

REMARKS

The Election/Restriction mailed March 12, 2003, has been carefully considered. The Examiner restricts the present claims into two groups:

- I. Claims 79-102, drawn to a method for making thin walled fiber reinforced component; and
- II. Claims 58-78 and 103-111, drawn to fiber-reinforced, thin-walled component.

Applicant elects Group II, claims 58-78 and 103-111, with traverse. The Examiner restricts the claims under 35 U.S.C. §121; however, because the present application is filed as a national stage of a PCT application under 35 U.S.C. §371, the restriction is improper. MPEP 1893.03(d) reads as follows:

Examiners are reminded that unity of invention (not restriction) practice is applicable in international applications (both Chapter I and II) and in national stage (filed under 35 U.S.C. §371) applications. Restriction practice continues to apply to U.S. national applications filed under 35 U.S.C. §111(a).

(emphasis added). Accordingly, for the present application, the Examiner should apply unity of invention practice as specified by in 37 C.F.R. §1.475, not restriction practice under 37 C.F.R. §§1.141-142. Therefore, because the present application is filed under 35 U.S.C. §371, the Examiner's restriction requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicant has amended claim 58. Support for claim 58 is found in claim 1 as originally filed and on page 2, second full paragraph beginning on line 9, of the specification.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has responded to the Election/Restriction mailed March 12, 2003. All of the claims are now in condition for examination.

In the event that there are any questions relating to this Amendment or to the application in general, it would be appreciated if the examiner would telephone the undersigned attorney concerning such questions so that the prosecution of this application may be expedited.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to BLANK ROME COMISKY & McCAULEY LLP, Deposit Account No. 23-2185 (000020-00017). In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith and in the event that a separate petition does not accompany this response, applicant hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely.

Any fees due are authorized above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 11, 2003

By:



Minh-Quan K. Pham
Registration No. 50,594

BLANK ROME LLP
900 17th Street, NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202-530-7400
Facsimile: 202-463-6915